

1965, No. 2

# HAMMER



# & TONGS

HAMMER AND TONGS  
1965, No.2

Table of Contents

page		
3.	SP National Conference on International Affairs	
6.	The Dominican Republic	
7.	Right-Wing Bibliography	Laird Wilcox
9.	Secretary's Report	
12.	Socialist Party Activities	
14.	Fund Drive Report	
15.	Weaknesses in the Socialist Party	Frank Zeidler
18.	The Socialist Party: Three Views	
20.	Vietnam: An Appeal to all Party Members	David McReynolds
28.	Excerpts from YPSL Bulletins	
29.	Norman Thomas at 80	

NOTE: Please send articles and reports of your activities for future issues of Hammer and Tong.

Socialist Party, U.S.A.  
1182 Broadway  
N.Y., N.Y. 10001

SP National Conference on International Affairs

The crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic provided the backdrop for the Socialist Party's Conference on International Affairs. More than 170 persons attended the foreign policy discussions held at the Hotel Sheraton-Atlantic on May 15 and 16, 1965

The first session, on Saturday morning, was devoted to a discussion of the future of the Communist world. After a general introduction by Ernst Papenek, Chairman of the International Affairs Committee of the Socialist Party, Rudolph Pakalns of the SP National Action Committee took the chair. Pakalns, who is himself a refugee from Latvia, introduced the discussion by pointing to a number of encouraging developments in the Communist world which had taken place in recent years. He noted that the competition between the Russians and the Chinese for hegemony in the Communist world was reflected in an effort by both to appeal to the national aspirations of other peoples under Communist rule. The following are brief and general summaries of the presentations made by the major speakers at the Conference.

Emanuel Scherer, Secretary of the International Jewish Labor Bund, discussed the implications of the fact that Russia was now economically and culturally one of the advanced nations of the world, and that the needs of its society are no longer compatible with the sort of crude dictatorship that existed in Stalin's day. He suggested that perhaps the economic and social basis now existed for the eventual development of the Soviet Union in the direction of a genuine democratic socialism, although he did not regard this as likely to occur in the very near future and said that it would require a political struggle to democratize the government.

Professor Richard Lowenthal of the Free University of Berlin analyzed the tensions existing in the Soviet Union between the technicians and the party bureaucracy, and stressed the continued key role of the latter in spite of the liberalization of recent years. Like the other speakers, he thought that further liberalization was probable under the pressure of economic and social conditions, and that this might eventually lead to genuine democratization. But he felt that this was still in the distant future. In answer to a question, he said that the Yugoslav example showed how far liberalization and economic experimentation could go without disturbing the basic mechanism of the dictatorship, which could always be called into play when criticism went beyond permissible limits.

All the speakers also discussed the development of polycentric Communism, both in relation to the Communist states and to the Communist parties in the non-Communist world. Professor Lowenthal suggested that we had to some extent been taken in by Soviet propaganda in picturing the Chinese as reckless adventurers in contrast to the sober and responsible leaders of the USSR. The real difference, he held, was that the Soviet Union had achieved its basic goals while China had not, and hence the latter still maintained a revolutionary posture - which did not preclude a very cautious practical approach. Dr. Scherer said that the changes in Western Communist parties, such as those of France and Italy, posed new problems for the Socialists of those countries in regard to their attitude toward inter-party cooperation. Professor Lowenthal thought that in the case of France, this problem was not likely to become acute because of covert Communist support for DeGaulle as a result of his anti-American line in international affairs. In Italy, he said that the Communist Party had, under Socialist pressure, been forced increasingly to repudiate basic Communist tenets on the role of the party and the nature of the state; he felt that the proper attitude for Socialists in such circumstances was to demand such changes as a prerequisite for cooperation.

The Saturday afternoon session, chaired by Tom Kahn, Executive Secretary of the League for Industrial Democracy, was scheduled to deal with socialism - and the movements which lay claim to a socialist position - in the developing world.

Developments in the Dominican Republic, however, led to a partial change of plans. Professor Robert Alexander of Rutgers, who was scheduled to speak on Latin American Socialism, discussed instead the United States intervention in the Dominican Republic, which he said had been a major blow to both Latin American democracy and to United States relations with Latin America. He pointed out that it had been strongly opposed by such major democracies as Venezuela, Chile, Uruguay, and Mexico, and noted that with the exception of twenty Costa Rican policemen the Latin American contingents which were to "internationalize" U.S. intervention came from military dictatorships, some of which had only recently come to power by overthrowing elected governments. John Lester Lewine, who had just returned from the Dominican Republic and had been there at the time of the revolution and intervention, reported that thousands of Dominicans had died as a result of the rescue of the collapsing military clique by the U.S. forces. He discussed the ties between the Pentagon on the one hand and Latin-American military groups in general and the Dominican forces under Trujillo and afterwards in particular.

Samuel H. Friedman, a member of the National Committee of the Socialist Party who has recently returned from a five-month trip to the Middle East, said that almost all groups in that area - even some of the kings - laid claim to the name "socialist." The two major forces seeking to wrest power from the old feudal classes were the Nasserite and Ba'athist groups. He found little basic ideological differences between them; both stressed Arab unity, and regarded an improved standard of living for the masses and nationalization of industry and large estates as the principal ingredients of socialism. In international affairs he found both Nasser and Ba'ath committed to "positive neutralism". This involved an effort to maintain good relations with both sides in the cold war and to secure aid from both, while at the same time continuing the struggle against what they considered the remnants of Western imperialism, the only imperialism which seemed important to them because it was the imperialism from which they had themselves so recently escaped.

Professor William Friedland of the Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations, author of the recently published book African Socialism, said that the lack of a native entrepreneurial class made it almost inevitable that the basic economic development that was the aim of all African governments should be carried out largely under government auspices. Foreign investment, he noted, was generally welcomed on a carefully controlled basis, designed to make sure that it fitted into the general scheme of national development and substantially benefited the national economy. In international affairs he found a strong desire to avoid commitment to any of the major powers, while accepting aid where it could be obtained without any sacrifice of independence, and continuing the struggle against such enclaves as the Republic of South Africa and the Portuguese possessions.

Sunday morning's session, under the chairmanship of Seymour Steinapir, Chairman of the New York Socialist Party, was concerned primarily with Vietnam. David McReynolds, Field Secretary of the War Resisters League, held that the United States had been wrong ever to intervene in Vietnam and should withdraw its forces at the earliest possible moment. He suggested that the United States should concentrate its efforts in negotiations on securing guarantees for the rights of the Catholic minority. McReynolds pointed to the atrocities which had been committed and were being committed by both sides - in the case of the South Vietnamese government, under U.S. auspices - and the continued agony through which the country was going as a result of U.S. intervention.

Joseph Buttinger, author of The Smaller Dragon: A Political History of Vietnam and former Chairman of the American Friends of Vietnam (who resigned from that organization when it endorsed the bombing of North Vietnam), described the special circumstances which accounted for the strength of Vietnamese communism. He said that this was primarily due to the thoroughness with which the French had suppressed every manifestation of indigenous nationalism, so that the Communists had been without effective competitors for the allegiance of the Vietnamese people. He also stressed the failure of the Saigon government to take any steps to relieve the peasants from

the oppressive system of landlordism, which took the major part of their production as rent, and from the heavy taxes which were levied on them. At the same time, Buttinger emphasized, the whole history of Vietnam was one of resistance to Chinese imperialism; under Ho Chi Minh, he believed, this historic pattern would continue once the pressure of American intervention was removed.

Summing up the conference, Norman Thomas denounced the idea that the United States could or should assume the role of a world policeman protecting people from themselves, lest they fall into the hands of the Communists. He pointed out that the development of independent and divergent national Communist movements removed the basis on which intervention had formerly been defended, and urged that a military withdrawal from Vietnam be accompanied by a large-scale program of economic aid specifically designed for the reconstruction and development of both parts of Vietnam, and going well beyond the Mekong River project proposed by President Johnson. This, he believed, would help to preserve Vietnamese independence. Thomas emphasized, however, that withdrawal should be preceded by negotiations, the central purpose of which should be to make sure that a Communist victory was not followed by massacres of political opponents. (In the discussion, Buttinger took a similar position and pointed out that not only Catholics but many members of the political elite whose views approximated those of Western socialists, and who had supported Saigon as the lesser evil in the war, were endangered.) One of the most disastrous developments, Thomas stressed, was the moral blindness and the willingness to consider any means justified which characterized the American attitude as soon as the question of Communism was raised. He expressed especial dismay at the readiness of labor leaders to give the President unconditional support both in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

Excerpted from New America

Dominican Republic: Socialist Party Statements

Text of telegram sent on April 30 to President Lyndon Johnson by Betty Elkin and Norman Thomas:

We are deeply perturbed by the newspaper statements that you are using marines not merely to rescue American but "to prevent a takeover by left-wing extremists." This is an assumption that Castroites or other Communists, not previously supporters of Juan Bosch, control the movement to reinstate a duly elected President.

If the Communists, who in the Dominican Republic are not a significant force, for their own tactical reasons enter into this popular upheaval, then the one best way to magnify their importance and win for them friends and influence that they would otherwise not have is for the U.S. to forcibly intervene to oppose the legitimate revolution itself, thereby confirming for the Dominican people the crude anti-American caricatures of the Communists.

It is not America's business to control the Dominican civil war through the use of marines. This so-called gunboat policy failed before; it will fail again. We urge prompt withdrawal of the marines immediately after the rescue of American citizens and we urge a continuation of the policy adopted by President Kennedy - the continued friendly support of the U.S. for Juan Bosch and his democratic reforms.

Text of NAC statement, May 5:

The Socialist Party urges socialists and other defenders of democracy throughout the world to protest the United States' unilateral intervention in the Dominican Republic as a violation of the Charter of the Organization of American States and the United Nations and of the sovereignty and liberties of the constitutional government of the Dominican Republic as affirmed by the voters in the presidential elections of 1962.

The allegations that the forces supporting Juan Bosch and struggling to restore constitutional government are under Communist domination are unfounded and refuted by the widespread manifestations in the capitol and throughout the Dominican Republic of popular support for the legal and constitutional regime.

The United States' intervention, far from eliminating Communist influence, is bound to increase sympathy and support for the Communist cause, not only in the Dominican Republic but throughout Latin America. The spectacle of U.S. armed forces engaged in combat with Dominican adherents of democracy recalls the tragic days of Soviet intervention against the popular government of Hungary in 1956 and is a similarly grievous blow at the rights of democratic peoples the world over.

We urge that the U.S. forces be replaced by an OAS presence for the purpose of offering relief and aid, and the conducting of free democratic elections under OAS supervision. We urge respect for the principle of civilian supremacy and control over the military forces, both prior to elections and after the establishment of a popularly elected government.

This statement, along with a press release, was circulated to U.S. and Latin American news outlets, to the Socialist International for circulation to member parties, and to Socialist newspapers in Europe. Letters giving our viewpoint were published in the N.Y. Herald Tribune, May 6 (by Norman Thomas) and in the N.Y. Times May 9 (by Robert Alexander).

A brief letter from McGeorge Bundy has been received in acknowledgement of our telegram to the President and saying: "His own view of this matter obviously differs from yours, but he is always glad to have the benefit of your comments."

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE AMERICAN RIGHT-WING

Note: This is part of Current Bibliography and Abridged Directory of the American Right-Wing, Second Edition, \$2.00 per copy, published by the Kansas Free Press, 1401½ New York, Lawrence, Kansas (of which SP-YPSL member Laird Wilcox is editor).

1. Adorno, T.W., The Authoritarian Personality, Two Volumes, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1950. The outstanding work of the American Jewish Committee analyzing prejudice, anti-semitism and other aspects of the authoritarian personality.
2. Alexander, Charles C., Ku Klux Klan In The Southwest, University of Kentucky Press, 1965. A regional history of the Ku Klux Klan.
3. Allport, Gordon W., The Nature of Prejudice, Doubleday Anchor, Garden City, New York, 1958. A comprehensive and penetrating study of the origin and nature of prejudice.
4. Bell, Daniel, The Radical Right, Doubleday & Co., Inc., New York, 1963. A group of distinguished American historians, sociologists, and political scientists explore recurring themes in the extreme rightist movements of the past and present.
5. Broyles, J. Allen, The John Birch Society: Anatomy of a Protest, Beacon Press, Boston, Mass., 1964. A study of the John Birch Society and the men behind it.
6. Carpenter, John, Extremism U.S.A., Associated Professional Services, Inc., Phoenix, Arizona, 1964. A frankly biased (to the right) analysis of the extreme right and the extreme left.
7. Burlingame, Roger, The Sixth Column, J.B. Lippincott Company, New York, 1962. A history and analysis of the radical right from 1919 to the 1960's.
8. Chalmers, David M., Hooded Americanism, Doubleday, New York, 1965. A history of the first century of the Ku Klux Klan: 1865 to the present.
9. \_\_\_\_\_, State of California, Senate Factfinding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities Report on the John Birch Society, Sacramento, California, 1963. A report on the investigation of the John Birch Society undertaken by a Senate subcommittee of the State of California.
10. Cook, Fred, J., Barry Goldwater: Extremist Of The Right, Grove Press, New York, 1964. An analysis of Senator Barry Goldwater and the men behind him.
11. Cook, Fred, J., The Ultras: Aims, Affiliations, and Finances of the Radical Right, The Nation, Vol. 194, No. 26, New York, 1962. A special issue of a leading liberal magazine on the right-wing in American politics.
12. Dudman, Richard, Men Of The Far Right, Pyramid Books, New York, 1962. A wide-spectrum report on the personalities who aspire to leadership in the conservative movement. A "who's who" of the American right-wing.
13. Ellsworth, Ralph E., and Harris, Sarah M., The American Right Wing, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1962. An analysis of the American right-wing presented as a report to the Fund For The Republic, extremely well documented.
14. \_\_\_\_\_, First National Directory of "Rightist" Groups, Publications and Some Individuals in the United States, Noon Tide Press, P.O. Box 713, Sausalito, California, 1962. (Note: A new edition is being completed. It should be published in late 1965). 2096 listings. \$2.00.
15. \_\_\_\_\_, First National Directory of "Rightist" Groups, Publications, and Some Individuals in the United States, Supplement, Noon Tide Press, P.O. Box 713, Sausalito, California, 1963. 1210 listings. \$2.00.
16. Forster, Arnold, and Epstein, Benjamin R., Danger On The Right, Random House, New York, 1964. The attitudes, personnel and influence of the radical right and extreme conservatives. Written late in 1964, this is the most current and, in our opinion, the best book on the American right-wing.

17. Grove, Gene, Inside The John Birch Society, Gold Medal Books, Greenwich, Conn., 1961. A "confidential, undercover" report on the inner workings of the controversial John Birch Society.
18. Hofstadter, Richard, Anti-Intellectualism In American Life, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1963. Winner of the 1964 Pulitzer Prize in Non-Fiction.
19. Janson, Donald, and Eismann, Bernard, The Far Right, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1963. A report on the character, activities, and background of the right-wing groups in America.
20. , Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XI, No. 3, American Political Extremism in the 1960's, Society For The Psychological Study of Social Issues, Worcester, Mass., 1963. A symposium on the American right-wing.
21. Myers, Gustavus, History of Bigotry in the United States, Capricorn, New York, 1960. A detailed history of Anti-Negro, Anti-Catholic, Anti-Semitic, Anti-Foreigner, etc. bigotry in the United States.
22. Newberry, Mike, The Yahoos, Marzani & Munsell, New York, 1964. A documented expose of the neo-fascist elements in the American right-wing and their interconnections with the so-called "respectable right."
23. Newman, Edwin S., The Hate Reader, Oceana Publications, Dobbs Ferry, New York, 1964. A collection of materials on the impact of hate movements in American society, including excerpts and commentary of eminent political and social scientists.
24. Overstreet, Harry and Bonaro, The Strange Tactics of Extremism, W.W. Norton, New York, 1964. The latest book on the American right-wing. Written just prior to the 1964 elections.
25. Randel, William Pierce, The Ku Klux Klan, Chilton Books, New York, 1965. A detailed history of the Ku Klux Klan. Subtitled "A Century of Infamy."
26. Rice, Arnold S., The Ku Klux Klan in American Politics, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1962. A detailed account of extraordinary and little known aspects of the Ku Klux Klan and its role in American history.
27. Sherwin, Mark, The Extremists, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1963. A survey of the right-wing extremists - who they are fighting, and where they are leading their confused adherents.
28. Strayer, Martha, The D.A.R.: An Informal History, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1958. A critical study of the Daughters of the American Revolution from its founding in 1890 up to 1958, a period of sixty-eight years.
29. Suall, Irwin, The American Ultras, New America, 1182 Broadway, New York, 1962. An interpretive report on the extreme right and the military-industrial complex.
30. Vahan, Richard, The Truth About The John Birch Society, MacFadden Books, New York, 1962. An analysis of the men and money behind the John Birch Society.
31. Walker, Brooks R., The Christian Fright Peddlers, Doubleday & Co., Garden City, New York, 1964. A study of the radical right and the churches.

#### Secretary's Report

In the recent March to Montgomery in Alabama, Socialists from California, Missouri, Illinois, Michigan, Massachusetts, New York, the District of Columbia, Colorado and Indiana took part. Other Socialists played key roles in organizing demonstrations in support of the Alabama march in Los Angeles, Boston, Detroit, New York and many other cities.

We are proud of the role our members have played, particularly in California, in the fight to repeal P.L. 78, the law which allowed the importation of foreign farm labor. Among those who have played yeoman roles in the struggle to improve living conditions for agricultural workers have been Norman Thomas, Fay Bennett, H.L. Mitchell, Anne Draper, Henry Anderson and Paul Jacobs. We are also encouraged by the recent statements of our Labor Department that farm corporations, if they want sufficient labor, will have to pay standard wages and provide decent living conditions.

Excerpt, Civil Liberties Union News Service: Two conservative student political organizations at the University of Colorado were first denied and then permitted to sell political information at a booth in the student union. Both groups also offered a Socialist newspaper, New America, to provide both sides.

Carl Dahlgren spoke in behalf of the Socialist Party to two Social Studies classes at the Nether Providence High School in Wallingford on February 24th. Questions that followed both sessions indicated the students did not fall asleep.

Comrade Rob Tucker, author of The Case for Socialized Medicine, debated Dr. Edward Annis, former president of the Am. Medical Ass'n., at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, February 23. He writes: "For the first time I was up against an AMAer who didn't red bait me or get hysterical, and it threw me off my stride. I think I did all right though...I've never been so heckled and interrupted by an audience, but it worked to my advantage. Lots of sympathizers were ALSO there!"

Mulford Sibley, Socialist Party member and political science professor at the University of Minnesota, was recently barred from Canada by its Immigration Department, a ruling rescinded after protests by House members. He has visited Canada twice since then to deliver speeches in Winnipeg and Ottawa.

New books by Socialist Party members: William Allen's The Nazi Seizure of Power and Martin Oppenheimer's Manual for Direct Action (both published by Quadrangle Books); and Richard Hunt's German Social Democracy, 1918-1933, Yale University Press.

Martin Luther King's article on Norman Thomas, "The Bravest Man I Ever Met," was a feature in the May issue of Pageant magazine (mimeographed copies available through the National Office, 5¢ each). The May Progressive carried Peter Irons' article, "The Race to Control the States."

"The Dissenter: A Profile of Norman Thomas" was the topic of a half-hour TV presentation over CBS on The Twentieth Century program on April 11. Scenes from his 80th birthday party were shown and Walter Cronkite interviewed Norman. "Reminiscences of a Rebel" was the title of a half hour talk by Comrade Thomas over N.Y. Station WEVD (for Eugene Victor Debs), on the American Jewish Committee program, "Dialog."

In the past four months Comrade Thomas has also spoken at 24 colleges and universities in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Kentucky, Wisconsin, New York, Minnesota, Connecticut, Michigan, Tennessee, California, and Montana. He was a featured speaker at the SANE Madison Square Garden Rally on Vietnam, at the Madison Square Garden rally in behalf of Soviet Jewry, and at the dinner in honor of Romulo Betancourt given by the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom.

Irwin Suall, former National Secretary of the Socialist Party and the author of The Ultras, spoke recently to a UAW Conference in Ohio on "The Radical Right" and to the N.J. State Council of Machinists, I.A.M., on the danger to democracy in labor posed by the radical right. He also, on an all-night program over Radio Station WCR, debated Reed Benson and Tom Davis, public relations director and east coast director respectively of the Birch Society. Through the Jewish Labor Committee for which he works, he has been active in arranging the Madison Square Garden rally to protest Societ anti-Semitism. On the subjects of the radical right, Civil rights and Societ anti-Semitism, he has addressed numerous community, labor and Workmen's Circle groups.

Indianapolis Comrades report that they have been active in support of an anti-capital punishment law, in a Vietnam demonstration which drew 100, and an Open-Occupancy demonstration which drew 250 people. Bloomington and Muncie YPSLs also attended these demonstrations.

#### New England Notes:

Publicity last month on the Student Civil Rights Conference organized on the campuses of Amherst, Smith, Mt. Holyoke and U. of Mass. included the names of Mike Harrington ("The Other America"); Tom Kahn (Economics of Equality); Norman Hill (AFL-CIO Industrial Union Dep't); Peter Irons (UAW. Washington Legislative Dept) and Martin Oppenheimer (Haverford Prof. and CORE activist in Phillie). To Western Mass. S.P. leader Leo Leopold these names meant a formidable S.P. representation on the 3-day program and an opportunity to spread our message.

Leo rallied his forces and the result was that over 1000 copies of New America was distributed to delegates, along with 500 copies of our platform. Over 70 copies of Tom Kahn's pamphlet were sold, along with our supply of Mike Harrington's book, Kahn's first pamphlet "The Unfinished Revolution," and Suall's "The American Ultras." An SP-manned table was available to the delegates all week-end and there was no missing our organizational presence. So much so, that a reporter from the Worcester Gazette, in interviewing Kahn and Hill, sought to determine if the whole program was some kind of front activity of the SP and the extent to which the S.P. plays a key role in the civil rights movement. In addition, Leo ran a get together at his house, with some of our Party-members taking part in the conference as his bait and a subscription to New America as the price of admission. It worked and several subs were sold. All in all a fine job by the Western Mass. Socialists.

From Earl Bourdon comes word on N.H.S.P. doings. On Jan. 11 Tom Kahn spoke in Claremont to an open meeting of the League of Women Voters on "The Economics of Equality." Drew about 80 - including local SP delegation.....On March 2nd a delegation attended Norman Thomas' talk for SANE at Dartmouth on the subject of "The War in Vietnam." Drew about 1,000.....Due to certain influences, Norman Hill was invited to address the annual banquet of the Sullivan County (N.H.) Labor Council. While in town he also discussed civil rights issues with a Unitarian Universalist Youth Group and with a discussion group in Claremont organized by Earl....André Courtemanche of the Claremont S.P. has been reelected President of the Sullivan County Labor Council.....In addition, SPers march on March 16 in a Lebanon (N.H.) Freedom March under the leadership of Earl Bourdon, while André Courtemanche led a group which participated on March 21 in a Manchester Freedom Rally called by the NAACP and attended by over 1,000.

SPers continue to play a vital role in N.H. labor movement as Al Reviezzo was elected President of the large Local 2944 United Steelworkers at Joy Mfg.....And Earl Bourdon spoke to the B'nai Brith on "Danger from the Far Right" and to the Maine Conference of High School Debating Teams and N.H. Conference of H.S. Debating Teams on "An American Nuclear Policy."

Gunther and Ellen Pfaff, who deserted Local Boston last year for Michigan, send their greetings and those of son Raman to the comrades here. Gunter is

working on research on educational and scientific films at Michigan State U. and misses Boston friends and "good movies", but prefers his rural life to urban Boston.

We still have a few copies on hand of the very fine labor history just written by Tom Brooks; former Local Boston member. Those responding to this notice can get copies of the \$6. book for the special price of \$4. due to an arrangement we made with the publisher thru Tcm. One third off is a fine book discount, so send for it now. You will enjoy reading and keeping this excellent volume.

#### Wisconsin Notes:

The joint meeting of the state executive committee and the Milwaukee county central committee approved a transfer of certain records and library materials of the party to the Milwaukee public library, at a meeting on May 8, 1965. Minutes, correspondence, books, pictorial records, campaign materials and other items antedating 1960 now have been transferred to the public library where they will be catalogued and made available for research purposes. The board of trustees accepted the terms of the transfer for the library. Mr. Richard Krug, city librarian, assisted by Mr. Orval Liljequist, handled the arrangements for the library.

State Chairman William Osborne Hart, legislative representative for the Socialist Party-SDF, has been making a number of appearances on various bills before the Wisconsin legislature. The legislature has a rash of "Rightist" bills and Mr. Hart has been appearing in opposition to them. He has received considerable publicity.

Ervin A. Koth, picnic chairman, announces that the date of Sept. 12, 1965, has been selected for our 65th annual picnic. The picnic will be held at Veterans Park, Milwaukee, and will feature a corn roast. Keep this date.

#### Missouri Notes:

Congratulations to Comrade Fred McTaggart, recently appointed United Auto Workers PR Director for St. Louis area. Fred and Pat send greetings to old CORE, SP friends.

"New Fabian" discussion series - Feb. 18: Gordon Burnside on "Liberalism, Welfareism, and Socialism." Feb. 25: Jim Hamilton on "Socialism and the Emerging Nations." March 4: Byron Lander on "It's time for a real War on Poverty." All meetings at 8 in the Student Union. As usual, the Fabians invite Goldwaterites to attend and join in.

Good luck to Comrade Frank Headbrink who moved to Kansas City to attend classes in industrial re-training. Comrade Frank, formerly Centralia's most vehement anti-Bircher, can be reached at 820 Washington Street. The name to Ted Koontz, past president of the New Fabians. Ted is likewise in KC, with the Department of Health, Welfare and Education.

Socialist Party members joined with the Committee to End Capital Punishment in Missouri in an appeal to commute the death sentence of Lloyd Lee Anderson. Governor Hearnes granted a last-minute stay of execution.

Activities of SP Locals and Branches  
(as reported to the National Office)

- 2-7 "Labor in 1965," Sam Fishman, speaker. Local Detroit.  
 2-7 Houston Socialist Forum.  
 2-12 Local Los Angeles business meeting. Sarah Schelly and Mike Hannan, speakers.  
 2-12 Local Columbia, Mo., business meeting.  
 2-19 "The Cybernetic Revolution," Aaron Levenstein, speaker. Brooklyn Socialist Forum  
 2-21 Washington State Socialist Party meeting, Everett, Wash. "Democratic Socialism," Carl Schwartz, Len Berggren, and YPSL chairman Rick Saling, speakers.  
 2-21 "The Student Uprising in Berkeley," Paul Goodman, Paul Jacobs speakers. Sponsored by Dissent and New America. Followed by a party, SP Lower Manhattan Branch, hosts.  
 2-21 Panel Discussion on Medicare. Houston Socialist Forum.  
 2-27 February Public Forum, Local Los Angeles. "Bracero Users Swindle American Labor," Norman Smith, speaker.  
 2-27 Local Nassau meeting. Discussion of local political possibilities.  
 3-4 "The War on Poverty," Harry Fleischman. Labor Lyceum Forum. Local Berks, Pa.  
 3-6 Reception for David McReynolds, Chicago.  
 3-7 Local Cleveland business meeting. Discussion on "African Socialism."  
 3-11 "The Battle for Health Care," R.W. Tucker, speaker. Central Philadelphia Branch.  
 3-13 Fund Drive Party, Local Detroit. Guest, Tom Kahn.  
 3-14 Annual Conference, Los Angeles Local.  
 3-17 Local Columbus meeting. Irwin Suall, speaker.  
 3-20 Memorial Meeting for Pres. Adolf Scharf of Austria. Am. Friends of Austrian Labor, Jewish Labor Bund, N.Y. Socialist Party.  
 3-21 "Socialist Policy on Vietnam." Southside Chicago Branch.  
 ? "Vietnam," Robert Pickus, speaker. San Francisco Local.  
 3-26 "What is Next in the Middle East," Samuel H. Friedman, speaker. N.Y. Upper West Side Branch.  
 3-26 Northside Chicago Branch meeting.  
 3-27 "Vietnam," Henry Schreerluk, speaker. Local Los Angeles.  
 3-29 Local Boston business meeting.  
 4-2 Local San Francisco. Discussion on CDC convention.  
 4-3 "Appalachian War on Poverty," Carl Braden, speaker. Bloomington YPSL.  
 4-4 "Appalachian War on Poverty," Carl Braden, speaker. Crawfordsville, Ind.  
 4-7 "Appalachian War on Poverty," Carl Braden, speaker. Muncie, YPSL.  
 4-9 "New Styles in Leftism," Irving Howe, speaker. Dissent and SP Lower Manhattan Branch.  
 4-9 Local Los Angeles business meeting.  
 4-9 Annual Book Bazaar, Southside Branch, Chicago.  
 4-10 Reception for Norm Hill and Tom Kahn. Local Boston.  
 4-11 Local Cleveland business meeting.  
 4-14 "Urban Renewal and Slum Clearance." New America Forum, Tucson.  
 4-17 Washington State Socialist Party meeting, Tacoma, Wash.  
 4-21 Local Columbia, Mo. business meeting.  
 4-28 "Vietnam: Your Government Lies," David McReynolds. Muncie YPSL.  
 4-29 "Why Be a Socialist," David McReynolds. Crawfordsville, Ind.  
 4-29 "Vietnam," David McReynolds. Terre Haute, Ind.  
 4-30 "Is Latin America Next," Robert Alexander, speaker. Central Philadelphia Branch.  
 4-30 "Vietnam," David McReynolds. Bloomington YPSL.  
 4-31 "What Next in the Middle East," Samuel H. Friedman, speaker. Queens Branch, Local New York.  
 5-1 May Day Parties:  
     Central Indiana Local, Indianapolis  
     Local Columbia, Mo.  
     Local Cleveland, Ohio  
 5-1 "Independent Political Action on the Left," David McReynolds, speaker. Central Indiana Local, Indianapolis.

- 5-1 May Day Rally. "LBJ and the Great Society," Anne Draper, speaker. Local Los Angeles.  
 5-1 May Day Dinner, Celebrating 100th anniversary of the Socialist International. Among speakers: Frank Zeidler. Illinois Socialist Party and "La Parola del Popolo," Chicago.  
 5-1 May Day Rally, NYC. Co-sponsored by seven organizations.  
 5-1 "An Evening With Murray Kempton." Brooklyn Socialist Forum.  
 5-8 Informal Evening with Norman Thomas. Local Los Angeles.  
 5-14 "Santo Domingo," Jim Gallagher, speaker. Local Los Angeles.  
 5-15&16 SP National Conference on International Affairs, N.Y.C. (see story in this issue)  
 5-16 Local Detroit meeting.  
 ? "The Civil Rights Movement," Houston Socialist Forum.  
 6-4 "The Johnson Mess in the Dominican Republic," John Lester Lewine, speaker. Brooklyn Socialist Forum.  
 9-4/6 Labor Day week-end camp, Workmen's Circle Camp, South Haven, Mich. (near Chicago) All SP members invited.  
 9-12 65th Annual picnic, Wisconsin Socialist Party, in Milwaukee.

# # # # #

Thomas Tribute to Steinmetz

Dear Mr. Reyman:

As I have already written you, I cannot, to my regret, be with you at the Charles P. Steinmetz Centennial Celebration on April 9th. I shall be speaking in the Midwest in fulfillment of long-standing engagements. I should be glad if you would read this letter of regret and tribute to Dr. Steinmetz.

To my sorrow, I did not know Dr. Charles P. Steinmetz personally. My statewide activities in behalf of the Socialist Party only began in 1924. I had, long before that, admired Dr. Steinmetz and rejoiced in the great service he was rendering to socialism and the Socialist Party at the time when there were few men of his scientific stature who were willing to stand out as Socialists. What he did was important not only by reason of the value of his contribution to socialism and socialist thinking in America but also by reason of the proof he gave that it was possible for a man of stature to be a socialist and still keep a post important in the American economic world. It is a pity more people were not inspired by that example. I am sure your celebration will do much to keep alive the memory of a man who on every account deserves to be commemorated.

Sincerely yours,

Norman Thomas

1964-65 Fund Drive Report      6/2/65

	<u>Quota</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
Northern New England	\$ 50	\$ 102.00	204
New Jersey At Large	50	85.10	170
Suffolk	100	163.00	163
Cleveland	700	1138.00	163
Florida	50	78.00	156
Detroit	400	601.00	150
Los Angeles	1300	1910.50	147
National Office	500	711.60	142
Iowa	100	140.00	140
Pennsylvania At Large	100	137.00	137
Illinois	1200	1620.00	135
California At Large	200	270.00	135
Massachusetts	500	671.00	134
Foreign	100	133.00	133
Missouri	100	122.00	122
Indiana	150	165.00	110
Nassau	600	600.00	100
Central Philadelphia	150	151.00	100
Local Berks	200	190.00	95
Pittsburgh	200	161.60	82
Columbus	30	24.00	80
Wisconsin	350	253.00	72
New York City	2400	1545.00	64
Washington State	150	82.50	55
East Bay Area	750	394.80	53
Arizona	200	100.00	50
New York At Large	250	108.80	44
Toledo	50	21.00	42
Washington D.C.	200	80.00	40
Northern Jersey	50	20.00	40
Ohio At Large	150	53.00	35
Boulder	150	50.00	33
Connecticut	100	33.00	33
Central Jersey	100	32.18	32
Minnesota	90	15.00	17
West Philadelphia	150	16.00	10
Texas	50	5.00	10
Ann Arbor	100	2.00	2
New Orleans	50	---	0
	<u>12,120</u>	<u>11,985.08</u>	<u>99</u>

## CAUSES OF WEAKNESS IN THE SOCIALIST PARTY

Frank Zeidler

At the Chicago meeting honoring him on his 80th birthday in November, 1964, Norman Thomas expressed disappointment that the Socialist Party was not as strong as he had wanted it to be, but reiterated that it still has a role to play. It is worthwhile to explore the circumstances of the party's failure to have a larger membership, and it may be profitable to comprehend what role the party can play in the future.

A principal reason for the failure of the Socialist Party is that it has been defeated by its own idealism. The party has stood for the public ownership of the basic means of production and distribution with democratic management thereof. Of course, this principle is not the sole principle of the party; perhaps the party stands more fundamentally for improving human life by all appropriate means, and one of these means can be democratic use of public ownership. However, in the mind of the public the party stands for public ownership of business and industry as compared to private ownership, and this sets every business man, private owner, and corporation employer and employee against the party. A Socialist can not hope easily to get a job therefore in private industry.

At the same time, the party has stood for civil service in the public employment. It has stood for clean government, no spoils system, merit advancement in the public service, and the employment of the ablest people mentally and physically in the public service because this is the way civil service examinations are conducted. Unless a socialist is brilliant and a good physical specimen, he can not get a job in the public service. Moreover, the private enterprise parties win the elections, and they are not bound by civil service idealism so their henchmen get the public jobs, and in those jobs they work to limit the amount of public employment for others.

These two propositions of Socialist idealism are self-defeating. If a Socialist advocates public ownership of industry vocally, strongly, and openly, he cuts himself off effectively from private employment, from prospering in small business, and from public employment. For practical reasons, therefore, why should any person who needs to work for a living advocate socialism or public ownership? The most he dare advocate is regulation of industry or welfare measures.

This dilemma is difficult to overcome. If after a struggle for public ownership, a person participating in the struggle sees that the jobs go only to people who can win civil service examinations (and play civil service politics), the person must be inevitably discouraged and must see that practically he is better off under the private enterprise system which will sometimes hire people who can't make the grade physically, literately, or politically in the public services.

Furthermore, in the concepts of public ownership and public operation of enterprises, there is always a heavy demand on raising governmental efficiency and reducing government employees. This further reinforces the fact that only the mentally superior and physically superior people can hope to find government employment. The average person will find the private employment market more merciful than the government market for employment.

Thus for the ordinary individual, public ownership, public planning, and socialism as he views it, is a threat to existence and to his job opportunities, for he can not find work under it.

In addition to this gross weakness in finding jobs and protecting jobs for people, the Socialist Party has evidenced another weakness. The Socialist Party has given of its funds, energy, talent, and manpower to worthy causes outside of

the Socialist Party for which there was no quid pro quo. The Socialist Party was in the forefront of the fight for the organized labor movement. The labor movement drained the Socialist Party of its talent, energy and funds, and seldom gave it any political support. The efforts of the Socialist Party as a labor spearhead were unsuccessful in getting vast power in the organized labor movement. Only the most daring of the present heads of organized labor today will give a nod in the direction of Norman Thomas, as a kind of personal tribute. Of the Socialist Party they are ashamed.

In the health and welfare struggle, in the fight for better education, in the fight for better housing, in which Socialist leaders joined under the banners of other groups, what was the reward for the Socialist Party? What leaders of these other movements acknowledged Socialist help with funds or their memberships? In the fight for clean government, what bureaucrats, enjoying civil service posts which would otherwise have gone to deserving members of other political parties, have recognized the value of the Socialist Party? Precious few.

The Socialist Party gave freely, it exacted no price, and has been ignored, shunned socially or, worse, been held in contempt as ineffectual.

This brings us to what role the Socialist Party can play in the future. It should retain its ideology as evolved in recent times. This includes concern for the whole man, and includes a willingness to use any legitimate device of government and social organization, including public ownership (but not exclusively public ownership), to advance the condition of man. This is fundamental.

In pushing this program, the Socialist Party must become more independent. It must not give its support to other causes and accept treatment as a poor and unwanted relative. If it joins the fight for civil rights or for the labor movement, it must do so as an organization which operates its own task forces and does not subject its members to orders and commands from other sources than its own organization.

Particularly in the labor movement, democratic Socialists must maintain their own independence of judgement and action, so that the party is not the tail on the kite of a labor leader who abjures or abhors its philosophy. It is a mistaken pattern for democratic Socialists to be uncritically subservient to labor leadership which is poorly grounded theoretically and which does not comprehend the nature of the changing social and economic order. It is mistaken service, which ought not to be rendered at all, to follow this kind of leadership. The democratic Socialists must point out instead the proper courses for labor to follow.

A third course of action is that the efforts of the Socialist Party should not be spent on the "Haves" of American society. I include in this "Have" group a large element of the labor movement which has reached the upper middle class status and which is well protected by federal and state laws and restrictive conditions of employment. This section of society is amply protected and defended by both major parties, and the precious few energies the Socialist Party has can be better spent with those sections of our society which can not help themselves. These include the poor, the aged, the maladjusted, the chronically ill, the exploited agricultural workers, the imprisoned, the children, the consumers. These are the people that the Socialist should now turn to, in order to render them assistance.

On the domestic scene, democratic Socialists must be the champions of people disturbed and disordered by an automated society. We must find useful work and

employment for every one in the service trades, in education, in science, in health programs, in recreation, or in natural resource activities. If management-union combinations seek to restrict the growth of such employment under the private enterprise system, we must join the issue.

Democratic Socialists must continue to fight for decent shelter, and, if the housing is public housing, for architecturally attractive housing with democratic management policies.

We must fight to divert enough of the national income to meet health, education and welfare needs.

We must fight for the oppressed Negro, and seek to help the ignorant white classes that have been set against him. On the other hand, we must require from all people responsible conduct that will not result in the injury of life and limb.

We must fight white and Negro extremists who would further segregate society.

We must fight to make our cities safer and more liveable.

We must fight to preserve our natural resources from capitalist exploitation and destruction.

We must meet the challenge of over population.

We must fight for expanded expenditures for science and research.

We must fight for humane control and direction of the products of science and research.

We must oppose Communist and capitalist militarism, racism of any type, supernationalism of any state.

We must work for a cooperative commonwealth of nations.

These shall not be our exclusive goals, but they indicate where there are needs to be met, where the Socialist Party can be effective.

We must keep ourselves alive. This means that we must seek to build our financial strength now by a concentration on our own programs and our own affairs, and by diverting what funds we have into our Party activities along the lines of the above directions. As a Party we can collaborate with others, but only as a cohesive and organized group. We must now make it rewarding to be a democratic Socialist.



## The Socialist Party: Three Views

Ever since its inception, the Socialist Party has struggled against, and successfully met, many serious challenges. In these times, we are faced with a new one...one of such magnitude that it may well determine the life or death of our party. It is the challenge of youth, the challenge of a young, often affluent, America. The atmosphere of America today is quite unlike that of the '30's - when many un-employed youth rallied to our cause. Few are informed about socialism and not too many will explore it on their own.

I am 16 years old and a Junior in a Catholic high school. I came to Socialism because John Birchers, by constant repetition, made me want to know what "creeping socialism" was all about (one cheer for Robert Welch!). Books by Norman Thomas, Upton Sinclair, Dr. Harry Laidler, and the English Fabians (among others) made me a Socialist.

But the average high school student (age 14-17) is incredibly misinformed (if informed at all) about democratic Socialism. I've been called everything from a Nazi to a Stalinist. But it is not all their fault. Most are part of that great mass of American society who cringe at the "word" SOCIALISM. Yet these students are receptive to new ideas (Socialism is new?). After reading the platform, etc., some have come up to me and said "Gee, Meg, that sounds pretty good." However, few of these want to "risk" (?) joining the party. There is great potential here!

The college years are too late. Many of these students are in-sincere and accept any idea they think "radical". -It's stylish to be radical, you know. I was appalled when I read (in the last "HAMMER And TONGS"), of the trouble in the YPSL. The in-sincerity (to the SP) of certain elements in the group only strengthens my conviction that high school students possess a greater sincerity and, if converted early, can perform much valuable work towards our goal of a new America.

I feel that we must embark on an extensive program of education - by means of speakers, literature, etc.

If we are successful in the high schools, our hope of a new world will be sooner on the horizon. These are the people who will build Our "Great Society".

Robert E. Meggison, Mass.

As the memory goes back to the years 1910-1914, the duty of a Socialist was to read the "Call"; if he was "caught" reading the "New York Times", he could find himself expelled from his particular Branch, or just despised. Woe was to a comrade, if he had membership in a church or some social club.

Now, we found ourselves, just in the opposite direction. The comrades are mighty few; if you meet her or him, and ask "what is the situation in the world?", the answer will be what he read in this morning's New York Times. As one gets invitations to dinners, conferences, all of them carry signatures of the party members; question arises: "When can they have the time to work for the Party?"

Some will say they are active in the civil rights struggle! Socialism calls for equality and justice, on much broader and deeper bases than the civil rights movement of today. Socialist comrades have to eat, so I do not blame them for holding positions in these various committees. The daily bread does not have to cloud the ideals of Socialism. I find the names of our comrades in the Jewish Labor Committee. There was a time when we had a mighty Jewish labor, with deep

devotion to Socialism. Today, it is just not so. We have no Jewish Labor - we have Jewish management in many unions. This management pours money to support a state in the Middle East that is chauvinistic to the core--drives out the natives in the most cruel way -and at the same time, they will march for voting rights for our Negro Brethren. Yes, we Socialists always fought for the freedom of the Negro - it is not new.

Let us let all the other groups work to the best of their ability. We should give them encouragement, but we should rather build the Socialist Party. A strong Socialist movement would stop a Vietnam misery, without useless demonstrations. The Establishment in Washington is not afraid of the cosmetic faces marching in a picket line. Of people believing in Socialism and working for it - they are afraid. Go to the desks of every public relation man - you will find them all cluttered up with anti-Socialist propaganda. The hungry, exploited and war weary world looks to the bright light of Socialism.

David Berkingoff, Bronx, New York

I wish - as I told you during my New York visit - that the National Office would give consideration to financing, experimentally for a year or so, a full time, eloquent and informed speaker to beat the bushes nationwide. Surely now is the time to thunder forth Socialist criticisms of the "War on Poverty", Vietnam, the Dominican Republic extravaganza, etc. The fellow could possibly increase our membership greatly. I hate to see only the Trotskyites represent Socialism in this area in a militant fashion.

Competition, I cry!

Ben Levy, Houston, Texas

\* \* \* \* \*

#### MEMORIALS

Comrade Emily Longstreth, of Philadelphia, died March 6 at her home on 1520 Spruce St. She and her husband Walter have been lifelong Socialists and Quakers. Their steadfastness in the following of a moral ideal serves as a fine example to those of us who are newer members of the Party.

Comrade Ivar Anderson, SP member for over 50 years, recently died in Chicago. He was very active over a number of years in the Northwest side of Chicago.

Joe Shaits, long time chairman of the Ohio SP and its frequent candidate for governor in the twenties, died recently in Dayton. He was on the platform during Debs' famous speech and was one of his defense attorneys.

Mr. Gerry Allard, Birchwood, Wisconsin, a former editor of the Socialist Call, and a former active member of the Progressive Miners' Union in Illinois died early this month. Services were held for him at Rice Lake, May 3. He is survived by his wife Irene, and a son, Robert Allard. Mr. Allard was an inspirational leader in the union movement, and a man of high ethics.

Mrs. Elna Norgaard, wife of Peder Norgaard, Milwaukee, died on May 3. Mrs. Norgaard with her husband was a long time supporter of the union and Socialist movements. She was a person with humanitarian ideals and outlook.

We have also been notified of the deaths of the following members:

Anthony King, Milwaukee  
Frank Weber, Milwaukee  
Sarah Conant, California  
Newton Ingram, California  
Hildegard Liebers, New York City  
Rev. Wolcott Cutler, Mass.

VIETNAM: AN APPEAL TO ALL PARTY MEMBERS

by David McReynolds

This article is an appeal to every Party member and to every Branch and Local of the Socialist Party to defend the 1964 Platform of the Party - specifically that section of the 1964 Platform that dealt with events in Vietnam.

Shortly after the February 20-21 meeting of the National Committee of the Socialist Party I resigned from my post as a member of the National Committee, the National Action Committee, and all other committees in the Party in which I held membership. Since my own resignation I have learned that another member of the National Committee - Martin Oppenheimer - has also resigned all his posts in the Party, and that an alternate member of the National Committee - Ian McMahan - has likewise resigned his posts. I want to make two points clear at the beginning. My own resignation was an act of conscience, taken without consultation with any other member of the Party. Following my own resignation I had absolutely no contact with either Oppenheimer or McMahan and did not know either of them were considering resigning until after they had already done so. I do not believe their resignations were part of any "caucus action" and I know that my own was not. It was a private action, not a political maneuver. What is at work here is not a caucus, but a crisis within the Party.

Because the act of resigning from the N.C. is serious and is, in part, a breach of faith with those who voted for me with every reason to believe I would serve a full term I want to cite briefly my own background in the Party as proof that I did not act in haste. I joined the YPSL and the Party in 1951. When, in 1953, a section of YPSL split from the Party to align themselves with Max Shachtman's youth group, I remained with YPSL and the Party. Beginning in 1956 (if my memory is correct) I have held national office in the S.P., first as an alternate member of the N.C., then as a member of the NAC, and for the last four conventions as a full member of the N.C. itself as well as a member of the N.A.C. In 1958 I ran as a Socialist Party candidate for Congress in Manhattan. Other posts that I have held include Branch organizer and member of the New York City Committee. If the merger of the ISL and the SP were important enough to merit history, it would be recorded that I was one of the three persons within the Socialist Party (the others being Irwin Suall and Gus Gerber) who organized that fight and carried it through to success.

I cite this personal history not to emphasize that I have served as a leader of the Party at its highest levels up to the day of my resignation, but to emphasize a period of faithful service to the Party during which time I do not recall threatening to resign from any post if I didn't get my way. Others have resigned or threatened to resign from their posts or from the Party but I have not. On one occasion I was censured officially by the N.C. or the N.A.C. (I forget which now) for having had lunch with Max Shachtman (this was prior to the merger) and on another occasion I was abruptly ordered to withdraw from A.J. Muste's "American Forum for Socialist Education" or face expulsion (I withdrew from the Forum - an act of cowardice I still hold against myself). But never once, under the most severe attack, did I offer my resignation.

I have resigned now because the N.C., by a tie-vote, has failed to support the Convention decision on Vietnam. Under ordinary circumstances if an N.C. breaks faith with the Convention which elected it, one would remain on the N.C. and use that post to organize a major political fight to secure adherence to a Convention decision. But at the present time I do not have the time which would be necessary to make such a fight and, therefore, if I remained on the N.C., casting only an occasional protest vote to be recorded in the minutes, I would be guilty of giving a kind of respectability to the betrayal of which I feel the N.C. is guilty. I would rather resign, knowing that the comrade who will replace me has views on this issue very close to my own, and hoping that perhaps he may have the time which I do not have to join with others in leading the necessary fight on this issue.

The Political Issue

In 1962 the convention passed a foreign policy statement which was clearly left wing. It was passed by a clear majority but several comrades, including Max Shachtman,

suggested it had been passed "by mistake", or because the Party had not had adequate discussion on the issues. However, two years later, in 1964, the Convention passed the same kind of left-wing statement on foreign policy and it was passed by an even heavier margin. The vote on the key issue, as I recall, was something like two to one. And the extreme right wing position advanced by Ephraim Friend was defeated by something like fifteen to one. As part of the platform adopted by the party the following sentence appears, at the end of a statement on Vietnam. (I quote here the sentence exactly as it appeared in the convention minutes - for reasons of style there were slight changes in wording when the platform was edited for publication). "...under no circumstances to continue its (U.S.) investment of men and money in war in Southeast Asia." (underlining appears in the original document).

As one step in carrying out this section of the platform, and in view of the growing crisis in Vietnam, the Socialist Party initiated a special "Vietnam Protest" for December 19, 1964. A full report of this appeared in the last issue of H & T. The Party had gained the cooperation of a wide range of peace organizations and it had made special appeals to peace and socialist groups abroad to join in protesting U.S. actions in Vietnam.

On December 15, four days before the date of the protest, a special meeting of the N.A.C. was convened at the specific request of Comrade Suall. At that meeting Suall introduced a motion which, after quoting the platform position on Vietnam, went on to say:

"Because the platform statement may not be too clear to some members, the NAC takes this opportunity to narrow the area of possible ambiguity. The Party does not favor a position of one-sided defeatism or the unilateral throwing-down of weapons by the South Vietnamese or U.S. Forces. We do favor a cease-fire, arrived at by negotiation and a subsequent peace conference aimed at the neutralization of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. In general it is the Party's view that in such a course lies the best hope of peace and democracy for Southeast Asia. In no case, however, is it our view that the role of Socialists is to strengthen the hand of Communism any more than it is to strengthen other imperialists or anti-democratic forces in the area." (The underlining is mine, D. Mc)

This was, obviously, a remarkable act of "clarification" of the platform. Where our platform had stated that "under no circumstances should men and money be invested further in the war in Southeast Asia," Comrade Suall, finding that this statement might "not be clear to some members", introduced a motion which simply reversed the meaning altogether. Where the convention said under no circumstances should we continue, Suall "clarified" this to read "The Party does not favor a position of one-sided defeatism or the unilateral throwing-down of weapons by the South Vietnamese or U.S. Forces".

I don't want to waste space here by going into the usual socialist polemics of dissecting Suall's motion word by word. Certainly it contradicted the platform. And, certainly, I thought that to introduce such a motion only four days before the slated action on December 19 was so irresponsible that when it came to a vote it would receive Irwin's vote and no other. To my astonishment, of the seven of us present, one abstained, and three - Irwin Suall, Ernst Papanek, and Rudy Pakalns - voted for the Suall motion. It failed only because it was a tie vote. Shocked at how close Suall had come to reversing a convention position at the N.A.C. level, I wrote all members of the N.C., stating that it was quite impossible for the Party office to be placed in this position where major projects based on the platform could come so close to being eradicated and that I urged the N.C., which was to meet in February, to clearly re-affirm the Party platform. I also said in that letter, not as a threat but as a political fact of which I felt the N.C. should be aware, that I could not in good conscience continue on the N.C. unless such support was given to the platform.

The N.C. met in February while I was on a speaking tour on the West Coast. It met at a time when Johnson had just escalated the war by bombing North Vietnam. Comrade Oppenheimer introduced a motion condemning the bombings and reaffirming the convention position that the U.S. must withdraw its forces. Voting for the motion were: Oppenheimer, Politzer, McMahan, Mendelson, Anderson, Meyer. Voting against it were Suall, Alexander, Papanek, Friedman, Steinsapir, Feldman, Horowitz. Following the defeat of the Oppenheimer

motion, Suall introduced a motion which, after being amended by Steinsapir, sounded somewhat more "left" than his motion at the December 15th meeting of the N.C. But it was a motion which failed to demand withdrawal of U.S. forces. This motion was also defeated, because comrade Hoopes joined in voting against it, making the vote a tie.

Thus, incredible as it may seem, the Socialist Party of the United States, meeting at a time of profound international crisis, passed no motion on Vietnam! My own resignation was mailed in shortly after this meeting of the N.C.

I do not feel any personal animus toward those who voted down the Oppenheimer motion, for I've known and worked with all of these comrades long enough to like and/or respect all of them. But their position does dismay me and forces me to realize that something is terribly wrong with the Socialist Party.

We must confront the fact that the convention position has been - in the view of many of us - simply ignored by half the members of the N.C. What accounts for their behavior? There are several reasons which I want to explore.

The first is "coalitionism". That is, the theory that the trade union and civil rights movements, in alliance with liberals and socialists, could more or less take the Democratic Party away from the machines, could split off the Southern reactionaries, and could transform the Democratic Party into a kind of Labor Party within which the socialist position would gain increasing support. There is great logic to the theory and to a large extent I support the theory. Unhappily some of those who adopt this position forget that the objective is to take the Democratic Party away from the "Establishment" and, instead, they seem to think that any criticism of the Democratic Party - or of Civil Rights leaders or Trade Union leaders - "threatens" the hope for such a coalition. Occasionally the "coalitionists" have been caught in difficult situations, as when the NAACP attacked the ILGWU and the Party didn't really know what to do. Generally the coalitionist group - led by men like Suall and Feldman and Alexander - shy away from any attack on Johnson.

This was almost amusingly true of New America's handling of the Vietnam situation. When Nixon called for escalating the war, New America attacked him bitterly and in personal terms. When Johnson actually escalated the war, New America opposed the escalation, but it could not bring itself to attack Johnson with the kind of vigor it had brought to bear on Mr. Nixon. After all, Johnson is a symbol of the coalition, he has a "good" domestic policy, etc. But surely there is something wrong here. Mr. Nixon isn't ordering any bombings, he is only suggesting them. The real enemy is the man who is actually behind the gun. That is, the real enemy right now, the man who is killing Vietnamese and seems determined to kill us, the man who has broken his own campaign promises, the man who has so consistently mis-stated the facts in the matter - that man is Mr. Johnson, the President of the United States. When commitment to a coalition leaves us essentially in a coalition with the U.S. Marines, isn't it time to opt out?

Another reason for some members of the N.C. "defaulting" on the Party's platform is an obsession with the need to be friendly with the trade union leadership. We are actually proud that Meany wrote a letter to someone or other pointing out that the Socialist Party is kosher. We are terrified of finding ourselves in open disagreement with Dubinsky. But in fact neither Dubinsky nor Meany have anything at all in common with the Socialist Party and neither of them even have a great deal in common with genuine democratic trade unionism. They have both had to be pushed and kicked into the 20th Century as far as Civil Rights is concerned. Meany - God forbid - refused even to endorse the 1963 "March on Washington" and his foreign policy position is somewhat to the right of the State Department. Labor may be - and is - extremely important in socialist concepts of how to change society. But the Party should abandon its abject fear of offending the trade union leadership. Isn't there something educational in the sight of Dubinsky and Meany rushing to the public defense of Johnson's intervention in the Dominican Republic? Isn't it clear they want changes in Taft-Hartley so badly that they will - and did - sell out a democratic and non-Communist revolution in the Dominican Republic?

A third reason for the inability of the N.C. to act swiftly in a crisis such as Vietnam is the "European" outlook of some N.C. members. I am - we are all - for an international party, an international movement. My attack here is not on these comrades because they are internationalists, but because they have permitted themselves to be intimidated by the leadership of the Labour Parties in Europe. We can, unfortunately, always count on our delegation to the International Conferences "not to make a scene" about such "minor matters" as excluding Guy Mollet from any posts in the International, or taking the German Party to task for accepting so much of the German nationalist and militarist tradition. There is a sense in which some of the comrades on the N.C. are too aware of our small size, and too impressed by the success of the British Labour Party or the strength of the German Party. In a sense they ask "After all who are we to disagree, we are so small - they might take away our membership in the International if we make a fuss". Thus on the matter of Vietnam several comrades were horrified to learn that, as one part of the December 19th Vietnam Protest, the National Chairman and the National Secretary of the Party had appealed to all member sections of the International to join in attacking U.S. policy. This was embarrassing because, after all, Harold Wilson was supporting U.S. policy (at least in public). Now, of course we should be in the International, but Harold Wilson is not our ally, nor is Willy Brandt, and while we should understand the pressure under which these men have to operate, since they hold power, they are not the men to whom we are closest. Our true allies are the left minorities within these parties and in France our real ally is that group of socialists outside of Guy Mollet's Party altogether.

We ran into this problem of undue respect for the International during the Algerian war, when it took the SP almost an eternity to bring itself to make a public attack on the French Socialists for what they were doing in Algeria. (And even then we were terribly embarrassed when someone got hold of our resolution and published it!)

There is a fourth factor, and it is our particular brand of anti-Communism. To a shocking extent we have forgotten that we oppose Communism because we oppose any form of tyranny or murder, overt or covert. We have been corrupted by a terribly sterile and sectarian form of anti-Communism. The real issue is not whether we oppose Communism but whether or not we oppose murder. In the Dominican Republic we were unanimous in opposing Johnson, and part of that unanimity in the Party was because it was clear few Communists were involved. But in Vietnam it is clear that Communists are indeed involved, that if the U.S. gets out the Communists will win (indeed, they have in effect already won). This produces a whole range of fascinating reactions. I find that when I urge U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam on the grounds there is no real alternative to this, I am charged with taking a "commie position". I am asked whether or not I don't care about the free trade union movement and what will happen to it. I am told that I am ignoring the massive wave of Vietcong terror.

Now, in fact, with the exception of Ephraim Friend - who does have the facts about Vietnam but doesn't know how to put them together - there are very few of those who oppose the convention decision who really know very much about Vietnam. To put it frankly, if one lumped the sum total of the knowledge about Vietnam possessed by all seven of those who voted against the Oppenheimer motion, we should simply have an appalling collection of ignorance and misinformation. There is, for example, no massive "free trade union movement" in South Vietnam. I wish there were - but there isn't. It is not true the National Liberation Front has won its power in most of South Vietnam by terror - that is so childish an argument it can hardly be taken seriously. Of course it has used terror, but it is also conceded by most experts on Vietnam that Ho Chi Minh could win a free election today in South Vietnam, as he would certainly have won over 11 years ago when the U.S. first began poking into the situation.

There really is no point going into all the facts on Vietnam here. They are available easily enough. The point is that our anti-Communism has so badly warped us that in Vietnam, where there simply is no "third alternative", and where in hard fact the end result of Western colonial policies is that the great mass of the Vietnamese do accept the leadership of a small group of Communists, and the only alternative to that leadership is a reactionary and corrupt military-civilian clique in Saigon, the S.P.

National Committee has a good half of its membership willing to see the U.S. continue the war rather than to take a "unilateral and defeatist" position. But in Vietnam the best solution presently possible is a U.S. defeat. I shall be extremely unhappy to see a Communist victory consolidated there, but such a victory will be less costly to the Vietnamese than any further "help" from the U.S. This is something which really is so clear there isn't one of us who wouldn't see it, if it weren't for the fact that the side which will win is Communist. We develop all kinds of scruples in that situation that, for example, we did not have in Hungary. I do not recall any Party resolution condemning the lynching of Communist secret police on the streets of Budapest.

Let me put the matter simply: if I must do more murder than the Communists in order to prevent them from winning, then perhaps my position is more evil than theirs. There is a certain point at which, having forgotten that it is totalitarianism which is the enemy, and not simply "Communism", we find ourselves behaving like inverted Communists. I have heard comrades suggest that while things are bad now, and the Vietnamese do not have freedom, if the Communists win they will never have a chance to have freedom while we win there will be at least a chance for freedom later. That is the old Stalinist argument that it is alright to sacrifice this generation because things will be so much better for the next generation. One member of the S.P. admitted that maybe the "Vietcong" had the support of most of the peasants, but that didn't mean we ought to get out. After all, he said, sometimes fascists have popular majorities too, but that doesn't make them right. (Which of course is quite true). What interested me is that again I heard the old Bolshevik line being echoed - ie., "Maybe it is true the capitalists would win a free election, but that is only because of their control of schools and churches. If the workers were only free to really think for themselves they would vote for us. And, that being the case, it is alright to make a violent revolution even if just at the moment we are only a minority". Where the Bolsheviks under Lenin substituted the Party for the working class - and justified it - in Vietnam we are substituting the U.S. Marines for the Vietnamese people, we are carrying on a war in their name even though they bitterly hate us for it and oppose our presence in their country.

Now, finally, what can we do about all of this? I would have several suggestions. First, I do not for a moment think the N.C. vote represents the Party. I strongly urge every Local to support Saul Mendelson's appeal for a Party referendum on the Oppenheimer motion. Let Suall and Papanek and Feldman and Steinsapir and the others who defeated the Oppenheimer motion prove to all of us that the Party is on their side in this dispute. I call for the referendum because I think I speak for the Party on this matter and will be sustained. If they are confident that their "clarification" of the platform is sound, let them put it to the test.

Secondly, since a significant part of the Party membership is in the New York area, it would seem reasonable to me that a major debate on this matter be set up in New York. I volunteer to defend the proposition "Resolved: That Johnson declare an immediate and total cease-fire so far as U.S. forces in Vietnam are concerned, and immediately begin their phased withdrawal from Vietnam". There are surely competent debaters to take me on. In any event I do challenge any of the comrades who voted against the Oppenheimer motion - or any comrade they may choose to designate - to meet me in a debate on this matter, providing that this debate is sponsored by Local New York.

Third, I want to make it quite clear that since I believe the convention decision was in favor of withdrawing U.S. troops, and since the N.C. has not been able to speak out on this matter, I consider myself a spokesman for the convention in this regard and - in various speaking engagements around the country - will continue to identify myself with the Socialist Party, and to identify the Socialist Party as favoring withdrawal of U.S. forces. I shall cease to term myself a spokesman for the Party only after a referendum or a convention which sustains the Suall position. The only other basis on which I can be prevented from identifying myself as a spokesman for the Party is by expulsion from the Party - and I do not think that the forces which defeated the Oppenheimer motion feel confident enough of their position to risk a Party trial.

Fourth, in the event that a referendum is held and confirms my guess that a clear majority of the rank and file favors the Oppenheimer motion, I would then suggest that the one item of business facing the N.C. would be to call a special convention since it would surely be clear that a new Party leadership was needed, and that a significant section of the old leadership ought to be replaced.

Fifth, assuming that the Party were to support the Oppenheimer motion, it ought to reconstitute the Foreign Affairs Committee so that it has a clear left-wing majority. And it ought further to obtain a new editor for the Party paper. Paul Feldman has worked hard, he has done a good job. But his political views are not, in my opinion, the views of the Party.

And, as a truly "revolutionary" suggestion, may I urge that in the future any delegation we send to the International be chaired by Erich Fromm or Saul Mendelson or by Darlington Hoopes. If necessary, let us raise the funds needed to get someone like Saul to Europe. And if we cannot send someone who truly represents us, let us instead simply send an air-mail letter extending fraternal greetings.

There might also be considerable merit in moving the Party office out of New York and into Chicago. But the one thing which is certain is that there is no value whatever in passing the right resolutions at conventions if we then proceed to elect the wrong National Committees. That way we are playing games with ourselves - we make the Party into a kind of social club where the right wing lets us pass the resolutions we want so that our feelings won't be hurt, while we let them have a good chunk of the key Party posts so that their feelings won't be hurt. That is all very fraternal, but in the meantime close to two thousand persons are dead in Santo Domingo and a great deal more than 100,000 are dead in Vietnam.

The United States needs a Socialist Party which represents a radical voice of dissent - a Party truly "of the Left", and which, without being consumed with anti-Communism, can offer a valid alternative to the politics of those grouped around publications such as the National Guardian or The Minority of One. Such a Party must be able to recognize the enemies that exist. Just now the nation which is killing the most people is the United States. The government of the United States is a far more immediate threat to the lives of the people of Vietnam or the Congo or the Dominican Republic than the government of Russia or of China. Let us realize that to say this is not to take a "commie line". It is to remember that socialism has a moral as well as a "scientific" base. It is to remember, in fact, that when socialism ceases to be moral it ceases to be socialism.

#### MOTIONS ON VIETNAM, presented to National Committee, Feb. 21, 1965

Suall resolution as amended by Steinsapir:

The National Committee of the Socialist Party, U.S.A., unequivocally condemns the so-called reprisal raids conducted by U.S. military aircraft, and aircraft of the South Vietnam Government supported by the U.S., upon the territory of North Vietnam.

Not only do the raids serve as a provocation to North Vietnam to enter directly and expand the war if that government were so minded, but they serve to re-solidify the alliance of the Soviet Union, Communist China and North Vietnam, and thus play directly into the hands of extreme elements on the Communist side. The New York Times has even pointed out only a week ago that the American "response" is playing directly into the hands of Communist China by taking actions that - however defensive in intent - lead to a steadily escalating and hence more dangerous conflict."

The Socialist Party calls for an end to the war in Vietnam. Our government has failed to date to propose negotiations to resolve the military conflict there. We urge the U.S. government to enter immediately into negotiations for a cease fire. Such a step should be followed by a peace conference, convened by the United Nations, leading

toward the neutralization of that country under conditions guaranteeing its independence and the rights of its political and religious minorities as well as its trade unions.

We urge an immediate halt to the present policy of air attacks upon North Vietnam since these continue and accelerate the path to full scale war in South East Asia. We reiterate the demand made at our last convention that there be no additional aid, either of men or money, in this war.

Nothing can be gained by continuation of this disastrous war. It should be brought to a halt now.

#### Oppenheimer Resolution:

The National Committee of the Socialist Party, U.S.A., unequivocally condemns the so-called reprisal raids conducted by U.S. military aircraft, and aircraft of the South Vietnam Government supported by the U.S., upon the territory of North Vietnam.

Not only do the raids serve as a provocation to North Vietnam to enter directly and expand the war if that government were so minded, but they serve to re-solidify the alliance of the Soviet Union, Communist China, and North Vietnam, and thus play directly into the hands of extreme elements on the Communist side. The New York Times has even pointed out only a week ago that the American "response" is playing directly into the hands of Communist China by taking action that - however defensive in intent - lead to a steadily escalating and hence more dangerous conflict."

But even apart from these immediate considerations, we believe the U.S. Raids functioned, possibly intentionally so, to divert the attention of the American people from a concern with undertaking realistic negotiations to end the war. The raids served to confront us with a situation in which negotiations are made more difficult, thus bailing out, for the time being, the military policies of both the U.S. mission and the South Vietnam government, and obscuring their disastrous course.

We do not accept the argument which says that the raids made on the territory of a country with which we are not now at war were made only in retaliation or response to increased terror employed by that country through the instrument of "its" guerilla fighters. There is reason to believe, on the contrary, that the guerilla raids were carried out in the fashion which has now become typical in South Vietnam: with the collaboration of local peasants, and with arms captured from the U.S. or U.S. supplied South Vietnamese. There are few grounds to believe that raids on alleged North Vietnamese "staging areas" will serve to weaken the efforts of the Viet Cong under such circumstances. To the contrary, such reasoning further serves to hide the real situation in that tragic area.

The real situation is that the U.S. government has for a long time supported a series of corrupt, dictatorial, and unpopular regimes in South Vietnam, regimes which have successively failed to deal with the problems of poverty and self-determination in the area. Under these circumstances, the pro-Communist Front of National Liberation has grown stronger and stronger until it now controls vast portions of South Vietnam. Left to itself, the regime would surely collapse in short order for lack of popular support. Yet we have chosen, in the name of protecting the "free world," to stand behind, and participate in, the most brutal policies of the South Vietnamese government, including continual suppression of democratic rights, refusal to engage in real social reforms, and large-scale killing, torturing, and imprisonment of people opposed to the government.

Such a policy is self-defeating. It can lead only to a takeover by the Viet Cong, which can perhaps be delayed at great cost in American and South Vietnamese lives, but cannot in the long run be avoided. Or, it can lead, as the situation in which we presently find ourselves well may, to an escalation of the war into another futile Korea, or

worse. Ultimately, there is the risk of escalation into a thermonuclear war.

We agree with persons of many nations, including within our own country, who urge the convocation of the Geneva Powers, or the intervention of the United Nations, to achieve an immediate cease-fire and a negotiated settlement of not only the dispute between the Viet Cong and the South Vietnamese government, but also of all disputes in the former Indo-China area, including the participation of all interested parties, particularly North Vietnam, Mainland China, Laos and Cambodia.

Apart from this we urge, and we have instructed our administrative secretary to so communicate, all of our sister parties in the Socialist and Labor International in nations in any way involved in the Vietnam war, to act immediately and forcefully to get their respective governments to sever further military and political commitments in any alliance with the U.S. government concerning Vietnam. Hence we strongly support the minority of the British Labor Party, our sister party, which opposed their government's surrender to current U.S. military policy in Vietnam.

We reiterate the demand made at our last convention, namely "that the government make every effort by negotiation to bring about the neutralization of Vietnam and to maintain a genuine neutralization of Laos and Cambodia. Under no circumstances should men and money be invested further in the war in Southeast Asia." This means, in effect, that we urge the withdrawal of American men and materials of war from the Vietnam area, at once.

The Socialist Party's National Committee applauds the courageous "Declaration of Conscience" recently made by some Americans, in which they state their conscientious refusal to cooperate with the U.S. government in the prosecution of war in Vietnam. We believe this to be one of many indications that the American people seek an end to this war, and we hope the Declaration will serve as a warning to the U.S. government to draw back from this perilous course.

We would hope that the lesson of Vietnam would not be lost upon the American people. We would hope that Americans might learn that Communism cannot be contained by military might and by U.S. support for self-styled "anti-Communist" despots around the world. Only constructive, democratic, and revolutionary (in the sense of really solving the basic problems of the common people, even if it means radical reordering of governments and economic systems) policies can successfully compete with totalitarian Communism for the allegiance of the world's peoples. In a word, only socialism can serve as a successful peaceful alternative to communism.

\* \* \* \* \*

(EXCERPTS FROM YPSL BULLETIN cont. from page 28)

rather well-known secret: the YPSLs originated the idea and participated fully all down the line. YPSLs have been also engaged in a letter-writing campaign to local newspapers, and Chairman Bill Peary has gotten out the first issue of a newsletter to all members and friends, to be used for general distribution on the campus.

\* \* \* \* \*

Those types from Ball State have some friends in Bloomington - and the Bloomington YPSLs report that many public meetings have been held and that Dave McReynolds is due to speak there shortly during his Indiana tour. Our comrades are in the center of any peace and civil rights activity that is being held, including a recent Selma March which drew 700 people and a Vietnam demonstration attended by 350, at which YPSL Chairman Rick Congress spoke.

## EXCERPTS FROM THE YPSL BULLETIN

A great deal of activity is the report of our Madison Wisconsin chapter. Our members pushed the Campaign of Comrade Bill Hart for mayor, a campaign in which he "...made many friends...and won invaluable publicity." However, small turnouts of voters in working class and student areas meant that Bill received only 4% of the vote.

To quote further from their letter: "Last Sunday YPSL sponsored two radical farmers (National Farmers Organization members) in a speech which was well-received and got a write up in the Milwaukee Journal. Plans are under foot in cooperation with some NFO youth here to start a Student NFO project.

Comrade Peter Abbott, Chairman of our Local, is a delegate to the state Y-Dems convention. Comrade Paul Mueller is a coordinator of the SDS March on Washington against the Vietnam war. Comrades Mueller, Joe Stetson and Maurice Knutson have been active in the Committee to End the War in Vietnam. The leadership is pro-Viet Cong and our people have been hissed at meetings. However, these three comrades were on the Rally Committee which planned two successful demonstrations, one of which had Comrade Bill Hart of the Wisconsin SP as a headline speaker.

"We have some thoughts about putting out a mimeo newspaper, and hope that our ranks will be expanded soon by a number of new members."

\* \* \* \* \*

The most successful meeting sponsored by the Boulder YPSL during the last semester was the one at which Norman Thomas spoke on the issues of the Presidential campaign. This semester Boulder is launching an educational series, the main theme being answers to questions such as: What is Democratic Socialism? Who are its enemies and who are its allies? What is its place in the U.S. and the world?

Programs include the Civil Rights Movement, the Socialist Party, the British Labor Party, Leninism and Totalitarianism.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Norman Thomas chapter of the YPSL at Berkeley has been engaged in some interesting activities:

1. Participated in activity in the Free Speech Movement.
2. Held a highly successful party at which a tape featuring a debate between Norman Thomas and Barry Goldwater was played. (This tape can be ordered from the National Office.)
3. Printed a pamphlet "The Democratic Left: An Open Letter to Liberal Students."

Things are looking bright, on the most politically active campus in the country, in Berkeley!

\* \* \* \* \*

Our Providence, Rhode Island chapter has already started to recruit new members. They are holding discussions on "Socialism and Marxism", the first one being based on N. Thomas' pamphlet, "Democratic Socialism", and are engaged in actively promoting anti-U.S. policy meetings on Vietnam. They also participated in the recent Amherst Civil Rights Conference. There are, they note, good possibilities for the future of Socialist work in Providence.

\* \* \* \* \*

Our chapter at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana, is really on the ball. They say that their goal is a hundred members and they took the first step by sending in some new applications, making their official membership twenty in just four months of activity. They've held meetings for William Hart and Don Anderson and are involved with pushing local housing reforms. Of course, the local Y.D.'s and Y.R.'s have refused to meet the YPSL challenge to debate but that was only to be expected. As with most other YPSLs, civil rights activity and peace work occupies the center of the political stage. Muncie, the Indiana town called by a state report "the town in which segregation is most likely to be met," saw a Selma March of 300 supported by churches and religious campus groups. We'll let you in on a

(continued on page 27)



## NORMAN THOMAS AT 80



### The Very Many Children of Norman Thomas:

A Souvenir Record Album of Norman Thomas' 80th Birthday Celebration; Also Thomas' Heart Warming and Fiery Speech  
Price \$3.00 per album

This is the limited edition that was made available to the sponsors and contributors to the Norman Thomas Fund. Now the 80th Birthday Committee is making this record available at this low price to Socialist Party members (and New America readers) until Aug. 15. After that, the remaining copies, if any, will be sold for \$4.00, with the profit going to the Norman Thomas Fund. So get your copy NOW!

-----  
Norman Thomas 80th Birthday Committee  
1182 Broadway, Room 402, New York, N.Y. 10001

I enclose \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_ copies of the album.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City and State \_\_\_\_\_

1965. No. 3

# HAMMER & TONGS



NATIONAL OFFICE  
ROOM 402  
1182 BROADWAY  
NEW YORK 1, NEW YORK 10001